



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,973	01/31/2001	Susan M. Janz	10003906-1	6287

7590 04/29/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/773,973

Applicant(s)

JANZ ET AL.

Examiner

Farhood Moslehi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15 and 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arndt et al. (5,724,510) in view of Yoneda et al. (6,564,337).
4. As per claim 1, Arndt teaches a method for correcting a network address for an object device, the method comprising:
 - a) reading, from a record, a recorded network address and a recorded unique enduring identification for the objective device (e.g. col. 2, lines 15-20);
 - b) querying the recorded network address for a returned unique enduring identification (e.g. col. 2, lines 15-22);
 - c) comparing the returned unique enduring identification with the recorded unique enduring identification (e.g. col. 3, lines 30-35);But Arndt does not specifically teach
 - d) responsive to a mismatch between the returned unique enduring identification and the recorded unique enduring identification, finding a current network address for the objective device and replacing the recorded network address with the current network

Art Unit: 2154

address. Yoneda teaches the method responsive to a mismatch between the returned unique enduring identification and the recorded unique enduring identification, finding a current network address for the objective device and replacing the recorded network address with the current network address (e.g. col. 1, lines 42-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Arndt with Yoneda. The motivation would have been to provide for a way to replace the mismatched network address.

5. As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.
6. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 2, Arndt teaches the method wherein querying the recorded network address for a returned unique enduring identification includes:
 - a) addressing a unique enduring identification query to the recorded network address (e.g. col. 2, lines 30-33); and,
 - b) receiving the response to the query (e.g. col. 2, lines 30-33).
8. As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
9. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
10. As per claim 3, Arndt teaches the method wherein querying the recorded network address for s returned unique enduring identification includes performing an SNMP Get call to the recorded network address (e.g. col. 9, lines 44-49).
11. As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
12. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2154

13. As per claim 5, Arndt teaches the method wherein finding a current network address for the objective device includes:

a) reading, from the record, a recorded hardware address for the objective device (e.g. col. 3, lines 5-9);

b) sending an network multicast request for hardware addresses (e.g. col. 8, lines 47-51);

c) receiving responses to the network multicast for hardware addresses (e.g. col. 8, lines 55-60);

d) searching the responses for a response having a match to the recorded hardware address (e.g. col. 8, lines 52-59);

e) extracting the current network address from the response having a match to the recorded hardware address (e.g. col. 8, lines 60-67).

14. As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

15. As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16. As per claim 6, Arndt teaches the method further including iteratively repeating steps (b) to (d) until a match to the recorded hardware address is found in the responses (e.g. col. 9, lines 1-11).

17. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

18. As per claim 7, Arndt teaches the method further including iteratively repeating steps (b) through (d) until a match occurs between the returned unique enduring identification and the recorded unique enduring identification (e.g. col. 9, lines 37-43).

19. As per claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2154

20. Claims 4, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arndt in view of Yoneda and in further view of Nelson et al. (5,835,720).

21. As per claim 4, Arndt does not specifically show the method wherein finding a current network address for the object device includes:

- a) reading, from the record, a recorded hostname for the object device; and
- b) retrieving the current network address for the recorded hostname.

Nelson teaches the method wherein finding a current network address for the object device includes:

- a) reading, from the record, a recorded hostname for the object device (e.g. col. 7, lines 1-10, the ARP table); and
- b) retrieving the current network address for the recorded hostname (e.g. col. 7, lines 1-10, the ARP table). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Arndt, Yoneda and Nelson. The motivation would have been for a place where both host name and network address could be easily stored and accessed.

16. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

17. As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.

fm



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100